UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION N	
10/578,693	05/09/2006	Raymond Bryce Bushnell	108682-148451 3680	
	7590 07/19/2007 VILLIAMSON & WYA	EXAMINER		
PACWEST CE	NTER, SUITE 1900	CASTRO, ARNOLD		
1211 SW FIFT PORTLAND, O		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,	,		3747	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Office Action Summary		Application	No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/578,693		BUSHNELL ET A	L.		
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Arnold Castr		3747			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicati or Reply	on appears on the c	over sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILInsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS CFR 1.136(a). In no event tion. y period will apply and will e y statute, cause the applica	S COMMUNICATION, however, may a reply be tirrexpire SIX (6) MONTHS from attorn to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
2a)□		This action is nor	n-final.				
3)							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>14-26</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>14-26</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from cons					
Applicati	on Papers						
-	The specification is objected to by the ExThe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	accepted or b) to the drawing(s) be	held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	FR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f All b) Some * c) None of: 1 Certified copies of the priority doc 2 Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been uments have been e priority document Bureau (PCT Rule	received. received in Application ts have been receive 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔯 Infon	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/11/2006</u> .	5	Paper No(s)/Mail Da) Notice of Informal P) Other:				

Art Unit: 3747

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

The record at patent office contain only 8 claims, claims 9-13 are missing although they appear to have been submitted since BIB data states 13 original claims. Clarification is requested.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3747

- 3. Claims 14-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,966,301 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference in claims is that applicant is now claiming liquid fuel vs gasoline liquid fuel. Liquid fuel in light of applicant's disclosure is and obvious in view of the disclosed gasoline liquid fuel. It would be obvious to now of ordinary skill in the art to substitute liquid methanol instead of the liquid gasoline since they have been shown to be interchangeable in the art.
- 4. Claims 22-26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,866 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference in claims is that applicant is now claiming liquid fuel vs gasoline liquid fuel. Liquid fuel in light of applicant's disclosure is and obvious in view of the disclosed gasoline liquid fuel. It would be obvious to now of ordinary skill in the art to substitute liquid methanol instead of the liquid gasoline since they have been shown to be interchangeable in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arnold Castro whose telephone number is (571) 272-4839. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWTF 3pm-11pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen K. Cronin can be reached on 571-272-4536. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/578,693

Art Unit: 3747

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AC.

STEPHEN K. CRONIN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Page 4